

April 1982

The Development of Political Belief Systems: A Multidimensional Comparison of Leaders and Non-Leaders

Robert P. Steed

Milton L. Boykin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Steed, Robert P. and Boykin, Milton L. (1982) "The Development of Political Belief Systems: A Multidimensional Comparison of Leaders and Non-Leaders," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 9 : No. 2 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol9/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

The Development of Political Belief Systems: A Multidimensional Comparison of Leaders and Non-Leaders

ROBERT P. STEED

and

MILTON L. BOYKIN*

The Citadel

* Financial support for the research on which this article is based was provided by the Citadel Development Foundation and is herewith gratefully acknowledged. We are also grateful to Professors Tod A. Baker and Paul R. Benson, Jr. who were involved in earlier stages of the project.

Introduction

One line of leadership research that has been given considerable attention over the past fifteen years concerns the degree to which leaders, variously defined, and non-leaders (or the general public) develop and articulate integrated or consistent patterns of political attitudes. In general, the studies done in this topical area have generated a broad debate, still unresolved to the satisfaction of all involved, about the nature of elite and mass political belief systems.

One school of thought, which we shall call "elitist,"¹ contends that a consistent ideology or belief system is held by only a small minority of the American electorate consisting primarily of those who are better educated and more politically aware. A number of studies supportive of this conclusion extend the analysis and compare the mass public with some group of leaders who are relatively more informed, better educated, and more politically aware to show that leaders and the masses differ in the development and use of political ideology.

This position was articulated by the authors of *The American Voter* when they argued that "the concepts important to ideological analysis are useful only for that small segment of the population that is equipped to approach political decisions at a rarefied level."² A short time later, Philip Converse developed the position more extensively in an article which still stands as its most influential statement.³ Defining a belief system as "a configuration of ideas and attitudes in

¹ This label is borrowed from Steven R. Brown, "Consistency and the Persistence of Ideology," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34 (Spring, 1970), 60-68. An alternative label, "empiricist," is suggested by James A. Stimson, "Belief Systems: Constraint, Complexity, and the 1972 Election," *American Journal of Political Science*, 19 (1975), 393-417. While either could be used, we prefer "elitist" because our focus is on leadership, and this seems to be more descriptive in that context.

² Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, *The American Voter* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960), p. 250.

³ Philip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Public," in David Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent* (New York: The Free Press, 1964), chap. 6. Converse offers a more recent discussion of his earlier research in light of other related studies done during the past two decades in his essay on "Public Opinion and Voting Behavior" in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 4 (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975), pp. 75-169. Also see, Philip E. Converse, "Attitudes and Non-Attitudes: Continuation of a Dialogue," in Edward R. Tufte (ed.), *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970).

which the elements are bound together by some sort of constraint or functional interdependence," he stressed that much a system would be characterized by abstract objects of centrality, wide scope, and constraint.⁴ The constraint concept, which is a keystone to this approach, refers to internal consistency among ideas; as explained by Jaros and Grant, "In general, the amount of constraint in a given belief system depends upon the interrelationships among idea elements. In a highly constrained system, idea elements tend to be richly interconnected, or to occur in clusters. In a less constrained belief system, idea elements tend to be more isolated from and independent of other elements in the system."⁵ In applying this central concept to data on the national electorate for the period from 1956 to 1960, Converse concluded that opinions expressed by a large majority showed remarkably low levels of cohesion. Moreover, he found that the low levels of internal integration for the mass public stood in rather sharp contrast to data on one group of political elites, members of the United States Congress, who demonstrated at least moderately high levels of internal consistency. Converse's conclusions received support from research done at about the same time by McCloskey and his associates which showed significantly clearer lines of position-taking on the part of delegates to national party conventions than among party supporters in the electorate at large.⁶

The opposing school of thought, which we shall designate "populist,"⁷ maintains that almost all people have political belief systems since beliefs are internalized early in life and continue throughout life whether or not they can be articulated. One of the leading proponents of this view is Robert Lane who has, on the basis of numerous in-depth interviews, argued that most people have political perceptions that can be drawn into coherent attitude portraits.⁸ In a recent essay, he maintained that "we *all* have unconscious premises. Much reasoning which seems illogical is seen to be logical as soon as the unconscious premise is stated."⁹ He went on to say that by focusing on the apparent integration (constraint) among political opinions as indicated in their static intercorrelations in aggregates, the survey approach as used by Converse and others fails to consider adequately the rather idiosyncratic political reasoning

⁴ Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems," p. 207.

⁵ Dean Jaros and Lawrence V. Grant, *Political Behavior: Choices and Perspectives* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974), p. 225.

⁶ Herbert McCloskey, Paul J. Hoffman, and Rosemary O'Hara, "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Leaders and Followers," *American Political Science Review*, 54 (June, 1960), 406-427; and Herbert McCloskey, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," *American Political Science Review*, 58 (June, 1964), 361-382.

⁷ Again, we borrow from Brown, "Consistency and the Persistence of Ideology." Alternative labels, such as rationalist (from Stimson, "Belief Systems") would serve as well, but we utilize Brown's for consistency.

⁸ Robert E. Lane, *Political Ideology: Why the Common Man Believes What He Does* (New York: Free Press, 1962). A more recent application of this approach is found in Robert E. Lane, *Political Thinking and Consciousness: The Private Life of the Political Mind* (Chicago: Markham, 1969).

⁹ Robert E. Lane, "Patterns of Political Belief," in Jeanne N. Knutson (ed.), *Handbook of Political Psychology* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 100.

people use to connect divergent political attitudes into personally relevant patterns of thought.¹⁰

The populist point of view developed by Lane and others¹¹ has received support from a number of recent studies. For example, Steven R. Brown, in experimental research comparing selected "articulate" (i.e., elite) and "inarticulate" members of the electorate found no statistically significant evidence that these two groups differ in the persistence of their beliefs over time; moreover, he echoed Lane in suggesting that the elitists are probably misdirected in their attempts to define what beliefs should be consistent with each other to indicate the presence of a belief system.¹² Additionally, Norman Luttbeg has concluded that reputational leaders in two Oregon communities show little more constraint in their political beliefs than do the general public.¹³ Finally, a new trend in the populist position has been developed by a number of studies postulating the existence of multidimensional belief systems among the electorate.¹⁴

From a slightly different standpoint, some investigators have examined evidence showing significant increases in the level of attitude consistency within the electorate during the 1960's and 1970's.¹⁵ Unfortunately, at least from the standpoint of understanding political leadership, these studies do not develop analyses of data comparing the belief systems of elite or leadership groups with those of the mass public, and we are left without clarification of this point. Stimson did show some variations in attitude consistency among groups having different levels of cognitive ability,¹⁶ and Nie and Andersen found some variations among groups with different degrees of political interest,¹⁷ but these findings did not speak directly to the question of mass-elite differences beyond

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 103ff.

¹¹ See, for example, Giovanni Sartori, "Politics, Ideology, and Belief Systems," *American Political Science Review*, 63 (June, 1969), 398-411, esp. p. 408; and Arnold A. Rogow and Harold D. Lasswell, *Power, Corruption, and Rectitude* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 120-121.

¹² Brown, "Consistency and the Persistence of Ideology." Suggestive of his point of view is his contention that "The great difficulty with one observer standing as critic of another's beliefs is that the first may not be able to see the logic of the other's thought processes . . . (T)hat which is not understood is dismissed as 'incoherent' or 'irrelevant' and not subject to further scrutiny." (p. 68).

¹³ Norman R. Luttbeg, "The Structure of Beliefs Among Leaders and the Public," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 32 (1968), 398-410.

¹⁴ See Herbert F. Weisberg and Jerrold G. Rusk, "Dimensions of Candidate Evaluation," *American Political Science Review*, 64 (December, 1970), 1167-1185; and George Marcus, David Tabb, and John Sullivan, "The Application of Individual Differences Scaling Analysis to the Measurement of Political Ideology," *American Journal of Political Science*, 18 (1974), 405-420.

¹⁵ See, for example, John O. Field and Ronald E. Anderson, "Ideology in the Public's Conceptualization of the 1964 Election," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 33 (Fall, 1969), 389-398; John G. Pierce, "Party Identification and the Changing Role of Ideology in American Politics," *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 14 (1970), 25-43; Gerald Pomper, "From Confusion to Clarity: Issues and American Voters, 1956-1968," *American Political Science Review*, 66 (June, 1972), 415-428; Norman H. Nie and Kristi Andersen, "Mass Belief Systems Revisited: Political Change and Attitude Structure," *Journal of Politics*, 36 (August, 1974), 540-591; Stimson, "Belief Systems," 393-417; and Norman H. Nie, Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik, *The Changing American Voter* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976).

¹⁶ Stimson, "Belief Systems."

¹⁷ Nie and Andersen, "Mass Belief Systems Revisited," 571-580.

suggesting that there may be such differences in light of past research showing leaders to be more fully informed and more politically aware (interested) than the public at large.¹⁸

In short, the broad debate outlined above continues and, in fact, has been extended to include consideration of additional topics such as the methods used to construct the models employed as the basis of the statistical analyses.¹⁹ Given the need for further investigation, the purpose of this paper is to examine data drawn from a survey of students at a military college in the early 1970's to see if leadership, variously defined, is a differentiating factor in the development of internally integrate belief systems. We shall compare various types of student leaders with non-leaders to see if these aggregates differ in their levels of constraint among a variety of political ideas. While we are fully cognizant of the disagreement (outlined earlier) about the proper method of approaching the study of belief systems, the technique which focuses on the level of inter-item agreement on a wide range of issues seems most appropriate for our purposes and is, therefore, the method employed here.²⁰

Since the study is concerned with a population characterized by roughly equivalent levels of education (at least, all of the respondents have some college education), education as it is normally used in the analysis of survey data is largely eliminated as a complicating variable. Also, identical questions were asked to each respondent so different question wording for leaders and non-leaders should not confound the analysis as at least one scholar has suggested it did for Converse.²¹ Finally, we are going to operationalize leadership in a number of different ways to explore the possibility that different types of leaders may exhibit different degrees of internal attitude constraint. The aim is to refine the present understanding of the political belief systems of leaders and

¹⁸ See, for example, V.O. Key, Jr., *Public Opinion and American Democracy* (New York: Knopf, 1965); Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963); Campbell, *et al.*, *The American Voter*; James W. Prothro and Charles H. Grigg, "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement," *Journal of Politics*, 22 (May, 1960), 276-294; Stephen V. Monsma, "Potential Leaders and Democratic Values," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 35 (Fall, 1971), 350-357.

¹⁹ See the *American Political Science Review* discussion of the subject by John C. Pierce and Douglas S. Rose, "Nonattitudes and American Public Opinion: The Examination of a Thesis," and Converse's rejoinder, *American Political Science Review*, 68 (June, 1974), 626-666. For a good general summary of the entire debate, see Dennis S. Ippolito, Thomas G. Walker, and Kenneth L. Kolson, *Public Opinion and Responsible Democracy* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), pp. 163-168.

²⁰ As explained by Nie and Andersen, "Mass Belief Systems Revisited," p. 541, "First, consistent views are not subject to the changing fashions in political terminology; they measure more than the facility with which people are able to bring rhetorical labels to mind. Second, examining attitude constraint is an economical and reliable way of studying mass ideology, whereas techniques such as those used by Lane require such intensive analysis of individuals that generalizations about national populations are difficult if not impossible. Moreover, even if techniques like Lane's can uncover some deeper structuring of an individual's political beliefs, in most of a citizen's interactions with the political world, he is presented with and asked to assume rather narrowly conceived alternative positions on political issues." Also see the similar contention by Warren E. Miller and Teresa E. Levitin, *Leadership and Change: The New Politics and the American Electorate* (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop, 1976), pp. 15-16.

²¹ Luttberg, "The Structures of Beliefs."

non-leaders and thereby to broaden the current understanding of leadership in general.

Methodology

Our data was obtained through the administration of a structured questionnaire to all cadets at a military college in May, 1970 and to entering cadets in September 1970. The questionnaire consisted of 30 standard questions grouped to tap six particular attitude dimensions, plus a number of background questions.²² The response rate, calculated on the basis of usable returned questionnaires, was 78 percent.

For purposes of this paper leadership is defined as "the process by which one individual consistently exerts more influence than others in the carrying out of group functions."²³ This definition is sufficiently broad to allow us to specify a number of different dimensions of leadership within the student population in our study. One is *academic leadership* measured by the grade point ratio of the student. Academic leaders are those with high grades (3.0 or higher on a 4.0 scale). This operational definition rests on the collective judgment of the faculty in evaluating the academic work of each student and assumes that influence may be related to special expertise derived from a high level of academic performance.²⁴ In a college community high grades mean high status. The second dimension of leadership is *military rank*. Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors are in positions of military leadership within the Corps of Cadets and are designated corporal, sergeant, and officer respectively. Those selected to these ranks are in positions of authority in the Corps and carry out functions associated with directing, managing and leading other students assigned to their organizational units. Rank is awarded by a board of active duty military officers serving as ROTC instructors. The third dimension of leadership is *organizational involvement* operationalized by club membership. Students who are members of one or more clubs are designated as student leaders. This type of leadership is largely a matter of self selection since students may decide for themselves whether or not to become involved in such organizations.

It should be noted that these aspects of leadership are not wholly independent but frequently are overlapping. There are some students with high grades who are not military officers and who do not belong to clubs, but military leaders are usually those students who rank fairly high in their class. Organiza-

²² The six attitude dimensions and the sources of the questions used to examine each are: (1) domestic economic liberalism-conservatism from Campbell, *et al.*, *The American Voter* and from Key, *Public Opinion and American Democracy*; (2) patriotism from H.H. Remmers (ed.), *Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1963), Appendix A; (3) political efficacy from Key, *Public Opinion and American Democracy*; (4) absolutism from John P. Lovell, "The Professional Socialization of the West Point Cadet," in Morris Janowitz (ed.), *The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization* (New York: Sage, 1964), p. 129 (we up-dated Lovell's conflict questions from the Korean War to the Vietnam War); (5) authoritarianism from Lane, *Political Ideology*, pp. 494-495; and (6) tolerance from McCloskey, *et al.*, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics." A complete list of the items in each dimension is presented in the Appendix.

²³ Katz, "Patterns of Leadership," p. 204.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

tional involvement is not normally dependent on grades or military rank (with the obvious exception of honorary societies such as Pi Sigma Alpha), but this type of extracurricular activity often overlaps with the other factors mentioned. In short, the dimensions of leadership are not mutually exclusive, a point which justifies the construction of a cumulative index combining all three facets of leadership. In the following analysis, then, we shall examine and compare the levels of attitude constraint for leaders and non-leaders as defined by academic performance, military rank, organizational membership, and cumulative leadership.

Findings

Academic Leadership. The first general expectation is that good students academically will demonstrate a higher degree of internal attitude constraint than average and poor students.

One reason for this is that high grades are in part a measure of the student's ability to see relationships, work out logical positions, and manage large amounts of material in an orderly fashion, or at least we can assume they do these tasks better than those with a low grade point ratio. We cannot assume, however, that just because this cognitive ability is present it will be used, nor is it difficult to imagine a number of obstacles which could block the development of an integrated attitude pattern. It is our conjecture, however, that the cognitive skills which make it possible for some students to become high achievers academically will usually be utilized to perceive order within a number of attitude clusters, including those examined in our questionnaire.

If we examine the paired issues in each attitude set and compare these with two groups with respect to their level of attitude consistency as measured by each aggregate's gamma for each issue,²⁵ we find that there is a tendency for academic leaders to have a greater degree of attitude constraint than non-leaders. Table 1 provides a summary statement of the percentage of pairs in which leaders demonstrate a higher gamma than non-leaders.

²⁵ A complete listing of all gamma measures for each pair of issues in each attitude dimension, which is the basis of all tables in this article, may be obtained from the authors upon request.

TABLE 1

Relationship Between Level of Attitude Constraint and Academic Leadership

Attitude Dimension	Academic Leaders	Non-Leaders	N	Total
Absolutism	87%	13%	15	100%
Tolerance	71	29	28	100
Authoritarianism	67	33	6	100
Patriotism	67	33	6	100
Political Efficacy	50	50	6	100
Economics	50	50	6	100
Combination of all categories	70	30	67	100

*Note: See the Appendix for a list of the items used to operationalize each attitude dimension in this and all following tables.

Among the 15 pairs of Absolutism items, academic leader have a higher attitude consistency in 87 percent of the cases. A similar level of consistency is maintained within the categories of Tolerance, Authoritarianism, and Patriotism with higher gamma scores among the academic leaders in two-thirds of the cases. However, on two of the attitude sets, Political Efficacy and Economics, there is a 50-50 division indicating that non-leaders have at least as much attitude constraint in these areas as do leaders. If the 67 pairs are considered together without being categorized into issue areas, we find that in 70 percent of the cases academic leaders demonstrate greater attitude consistency than non-leaders.

These findings should be modified by the observation that the differences in gamma scores between leadership categories are very slight in many instances, and the patterns of attitude constraint are often quite similar. Among those issue pairs where there are high levels of consistency among the leaders we usually find high levels of consistency among non-leaders, albeit with somewhat lower gammas in general. The evidence is sufficiently mixed to quiet any cries of *Eurika*; however, these findings do provide support for the generalization that at least among academic leaders we can see more attitude constraint than among non-leaders.

Organizational Leaders. The second expectation is that students who are involved in organizations are more likely to demonstrate a higher degree of internal attitude constraint than those who are not.

While our operational definition of an organizational leader (i.e., a student who belongs to one or more clubs) is not very rigorous, organizational membership is frequently related to other aspects of leadership such as holding public office. It seems reasonable that those students who voluntarily join clubs will also be those who can make sense out of the issues and develop a greater sense of the inter-relatedness among their attitudes than those who remain more or less isolated organizationally.

TABLE 2
*Relationships Between Level of Attitude Constraint
 and Organizational Leadership*

<i>Attitude Dimension</i>	<i>Organ. Leaders</i>	<i>Non- Leaders</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Total</i>
Economics	100%	0%	6	100%
Political Efficacy	83	17	6	100
Tolerance	82	18	28	100
Patriotism	67	33	6	100
Authoritarianism	50	50	6	100
Absolutism	33	67	15	100
Combination of all categories	69	31	67	100

* Note: See Appendix A for list of gamma measures of association for each pair of issues used to operationalize the attitude dimensions.

Comparing the paired issues in each attitude set reveals that organizational leadership as it is used here is a differentiating factor. As the summary data in Table 2 indicates, in 100 percent of the paired issues in the Economic category organizational leaders have higher gammas than non-leaders. The percentages for Political Efficacy and Tolerance (83 percent and 82 percent respectively) are almost as impressive, and the scores in the Patriotism category are not far behind with 67 percent of the paired issues showing a higher gamma for students who belong to organizations. On the Authoritarianism dimension, organizational leaders and non-leaders divide equally, and on the dimension of Absolutism non-leaders show greater internal consistency than do the leaders. When all of the issue pairs are considered together without being divided into attitude clusters, leaders again demonstrate the greater degree of constraint. The organizational leaders' gammas are higher than the non-leaders' gammas on 69 percent of the paired issues. While the gamma scores again are not strikingly different in magnitude for a substantial number of cases, there is still some fairly clear and consistent pattern beginning to emerge since in the previous discussion concerning academic leaders 70 percent of the paired issues showed higher gammas for those students with high academic grades (leaders) than for those with lower academic grades.

Military leadership. The third generalization is that military leaders are more likely to demonstrate a higher degree of internal attitude constraint than non-leaders. Students who are military leaders are more likely to demonstrate a higher degree of internal attitude constraint than non-leaders. Students who are military leaders are easily identifiable because all but a few special students wear uniforms. Military leaders have distinguishing insignia and perform functions which classify them as an elite in the highly structured Corps of Cadets. They essentially exercise control and influence on every facet of cadet life outside the classroom. These experiences should make it possible for them to develop a more integrated view of the social environment and to attain a greater

sense of mastery of their situation. Military leaders should have strong egos capable of imposing order on the world around them, and this, in turn, should help them to perceive consistent relationships between the various items in the attitude clusters under investigation. It is for this reason that we think military leaders are more likely to have cohesive attitude patterns than non-leaders.

If, as in the previous discussion, we compare the gamma measure of association between pairs of questions in each attitude set, we find that in four out of six categories there is a tendency for military leaders to have greater attitude consistency than non-leaders. Table 3 indicates that military leaders have higher gammas in 85 percent of the paired issues in both the Authoritarianism and Political Efficacy dimensions. Although the percentage is not as high in the areas of Economics and Tolerance (67 percent and 57 percent respectively), we see that more than half of the students with military rank have higher gamma scores than do students with no rank.

TABLE 3.

Relationship Between Level of Attitude Constraint and Military Leadership.

<i>Attitude Dimension</i>	<i>Military Leaders</i>	<i>Non- leaders</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Total</i>
Authoritarianism	85%	15%	6	100%
Political Efficacy	85	15	6	100
Economics	67	33	6	100
Tolerance	57	43	28	100
Patriotism	50	50	6	100
Absolutism	40	60	15	100
Combination of all categories	58	42	67	100

* Note: See Appendix A for a list of gamma measures of association for each pair of issues used to operationalize the attitude dimension.

When one considers Patriotism, both groups of student demonstrate about the same level of attitude cohesion. The category of Absolutism is the only dimension where non-leaders have a greater sense of constraint than do leaders. Although we cannot account for this unexpected variation, the overall pattern seems to support the generalization that military leaders have a greater degree of issue cohesiveness than do non-leaders, even though the differences should not be exaggerated. It could be that military leaders are a fairly representative sample of the Corps and that they reflect only slightly higher degrees of sophistication in dealing with the issues examined here.

Cumulative Leaders. From the preceding discussion, it is logical to expect that students who are leaders on all three of the leadership dimensions will demonstrate more highly integrated attitudes than those who are not leaders in this cumulative sense. As shown in Table 4, this expectation is generally confirmed when the issues are paired.

TABLE 4.

*Relationship Between Level of Attitude Constraint
and Cumulative Leadership.*

<i>Attitude Dimension</i>	<i>Cumulative Leaders</i>	<i>Non- leaders</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Total</i>
Absolutism	87%	13%	15	100%
Tolerance	82	18	28	100
Authoritarianism	67	33	6	100
Political Efficacy	67	33	6	100
Patriotism	67	33	6	100
Economics	50	50	6	100
Combination of all categories	75	25	67	100

* Note: See Appendix A for a list of gamma measures of association use to operationalize the attitude dimension.

In both the Absolutism and Tolerance issues areas, the gammas for the leaders are higher in over four-fifths of the paired issues (87 percent and 82 percent respectively). In three of the four remaining issue sets, these leaders' gammas are higher on two-thirds of the paired issues. Only on one dimension, Economics, do the non-leaders show about the same level of attitude cohesion as do the leaders, and on none do they show more constraint. Overall, the leaders have more highly integrated attitudes on three-fourths of the paired issues.

Discussion

In general, our findings are supportive of the elitist argument that leaders have more highly integrated belief systems than non-leaders. While the differences we have examined are sometimes quite modest (even, on occasion, virtually non-existent), and while the patterns are normally mixed within each attitude set and from leadership group to leadership group, we have still found rather clear evidence that all of the four dimensions of leadership utilized here are associated with more highly constrained attitudes, at least with respect to the issues included in the study.

Although we found that leaders demonstrate more evidence of attitude consistency than non-leaders, it should be emphasized that different types of leaders show greater cohesiveness in one issue area than in another. Leadership cannot be conceptualized as a single dimension.²⁶ Table 5 shows the variations among the leadership aggregates quite clearly. For example, academic leaders most consistently outrank non-leaders in constraint in the Absolutism

²⁶ See, for example, Wendell Bell, *et al.*, *Public Leadership* (San Francisco: Chandler, 1961); and Katz, "Patterns of Leadership."

TABLE 5.

Rank Ordering of Levels of Attitude Constraint for three types of leadership.

	LEADERSHIP		
	Academic Ranking	Organizational Ranking	Military Ranking
Issue	1. Absolutism	1. Economics	1. Authoritarianism
Areas	2. Tolerance	2. Political Efficacy	2. Political Efficacy
	3. Authoritarianism	3. Tolerance	3. Economics
	4. Patriotism	4. Patriotism	4. Tolerance
	5. Political Efficacy	5. Authoritarianism	5. Patriotism
	6. Economics	6. Absolutism	6. Absolutism
	Academic/Organizational	Spearman $R_s = -.828$.	
	Academic/Military	Spearman $R_s = -.143$.	
	Organizational/Military	Spearman $R_s = +.772$.	

issue set whereas both organizational and military leaders do most poorly relative to non-leaders in this issue area. If one looks at Political Efficacy, organizational and military leaders demonstrate a higher level of cohesion compared to non-leaders relative to the other categories in their respective columns than do the academic leaders. For academic leaders Political Efficacy ranks fifth in comparative constraint while with both organizational and military leaders it ranks second. The Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (r_s) between academic and organizational leaders is $-.828$ showing almost a reversal of ranking between these two leadership types. The Spearman's r_s of $-.143$ between academic and military leaders shows very little relationship, but when one examines the Spearman's r_s between organizational and military leaders there is a strong positive relationship of $+.772$. The overall pattern seems to be that academic leaders in contradistinction to organizational and military leaders show different configurations of attitude constraint relative to non-leaders. In spite of these aggregate variations, all categories of leaders apparently do have more highly developed belief systems than non-leaders.

This conclusion must be put in the proper perspective. We feel that our data offers a good test of the problem posed in the Introduction, but we recognize at the same time that generalizations are limited by such things as the issues considered, the operational definitions of leadership used, the nature of the population examined (i.e., male students at a military college), and the methodology employed. Certainly, then, the debate over elite and mass belief systems is not resolved by our findings, but a good case can be made that they do supplement existing material and, thereby, shed additional light on a complex topic.

Clearly, leadership is a significant factor in the study of political attitudes, and it deserves further investigation. As Daniel Katz has noted, even though

political leadership is a much studied topic, it remains in need of significant additional research.²⁷ At least three points for further research are suggested by our analysis. First, in the study of belief systems various types of leadership should be considered; as has been shown, leadership is not unidimensional, and this will hopefully be further elaborated in the future. Second, the material presented here indicates that leadership as a differentiating variable in the development of political belief systems apparently appears fairly early in life — at least by the late teens and early twenties. Even though this is beyond the scope of this paper, this well might be a fruitful avenue of inquiry for future research into the early stages of the political socialization process. Third, leaders and non-leaders should be more carefully compared with respect to the substance of their political belief systems. Although some research has delved into such a comparison, most of these efforts have covered a small number of issues and have not considered more than one leadership dimension.²⁸ A logical extension of the present paper would focus on a substantive comparison of the belief systems of leaders (variously defined) and non-leaders.

Appendix

Questionnaire Items Used to Operationalize Attitude Dimensions

Each Respondent was asked whether he strongly agreed, slightly agreed, slightly disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each of the following items:

Economics

(from Campbell, *et al.*, 1960)

<i>Variable Name</i>	<i>Statement</i>
1. Jobs	The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.
2. Electric Power-Housing	The government in Washington should leave things like electric power and housing for private businessmen to handle.
3. Educational aid	If cities and towns around the country need help to build more schools, the government in Washington ought to give them the money they need.
4. Medical aid	The government in Washington ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.

Patriotism

(from Remmers, 1963)

1. Loyalty	In these days, patriotism and loyalty to established American ways are the <i>most</i> important requirements of a good citizen.
------------	--

²⁷ Katz, "Patterns of Leadership."

²⁸ For example, McCloskey, *et al.*, "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Leaders and Followers"; Prothro and Grigg, "Fundamental Principles of Democracy"; Monsma, "Potential Leaders and Democratic Values"; and Stimson, "Belief Systems."

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 2. Ethnocentrism | Foreign countries have very little to contribute to American progress. |
| 3. Status Quo | We should firmly resist any attempts to change the American way of life. |
| 4. Flag Respect | The average citizen does not show enough respect for the U. S. Flag. |

Authoritarianism

(from Lane, 1962)

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| 1. Discipline | What young people need most of all is strict discipline by their parents. |
| 2. Will Power | Most people who do not get ahead just do not have enough will power. |
| 3. Strong Leaders | A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk. |
| 4. Honor | People sometimes say that an insult to your honor should not be forgotten. Do you agree or disagree with that? |

Tolerance

(from McCloskey, 1964)

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| 1. Vote | People ought to be allowed to vote even if they cannot do so intelligently. |
| 2. Force | The true American way of life is disappearing so fast that we may have to use force to save it. |
| 3. Foreign ideas | Freedom does not give anyone the right to teach foreign ideas in our schools. |
| 4. Bad books | A book that contains wrong political views cannot be a good book and does not deserve to be published. |
| 5. Due Process | In dealing with dangerous enemies like the Communists, we cannot afford to depend on the courts, the laws and their slow and unreliable methods. |
| 6. Integration | Regardless of what some people say, there are certain races in the world that just will not mix with Americans. |
| 7. Neighborhood | The trouble with letting certain minority groups into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it their own atmosphere. |
| 8. Open elections | It is unwise to give people with dangerous social and economic viewpoints a chance to be elected. |

Political Efficacy

(from Key, 1965)

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Public officials | I do not think public officials care much what people like me think. |
|---------------------|--|

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 2. Voting | Voting is the only way people like me can have any say about how the government runs things. |
| 3. No say | People like me do not have any say about what the government does. |
| 4. Confused | Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me cannot really understand what is going on. |

Absolutism

(from Lovell, 1964)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Total war | All out war is likely within the next 15 years. |
| 2. Nuclear war | Limited nuclear war between the U.S. and Communist forces is likely within 15 years. |
| 3. Limited war | Limited conventional war between the U.S. and Communist forces is likely within 15 years. |
| 4. Neutrality | Neutrality is caused by Communist influence in the neutral nation's government. |
| 5. Communist
Control | The Vietnam Conflict is a good illustration of the fact that the Communists are determined to conquer the world. |
| 6. Victory Denial | The Vietnam Conflict is a good illustration of a conflict in which U.S. forces have been denied victory unnecessarily. |